

CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance
Vol. XXXIV No. 10 Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper October, 1983

THIRTY YEARS ON

by ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE

Back in the old days of A. K. Chesterton and the *Candour*-League movement, it was the custom at the A.G.M. of the League of Empire Loyalists and at the *Candour* Dinner to review the action and achievement of the year past. There was always a great deal of significant action to report, and although no major victory was recorded, the daily political war of attrition included enough minor successes to keep "the troops" in good heart. Today's active nationalists, if they are honest, will recognise that the present scene is much the same except for one vital difference: the almost total lack of any opportunity to present our case to the public in any coherent form. Except for the odd "five minutes" on television bought at the price of glaring and humiliating electoral defeats, the right image simply does not exist. The media shows "confrontations" and speaks only of the "Right wing" or "far Right", which is invariably presented as obscenely *wrong*. To the ordinary viewer or listener, to be *Right* is to be at worst a neo-Nazi bomber, at best a Fascist robber and disturber of the peace, or else an instigator and supporter of one or the other or both.

This has come about because of the modern nationalist obsession with frontal attack. Marches, elections and "showing the flag" are all activities to be undertaken with advantage by organisations operating from strength — in numbers if nothing else. When the only result of such demonstrations is a show of weakness, the means entirely "unjustifies" the end and lays the performers open to the sort of abuse indulged in by the media-hypnotised majority who, in turn, are activated by selected ethnic minority instigators. Sad to say, too often the Right's reply to such abuse is an indignant attempt to popularise Hitler! A generation brought up on the "Holocaust" is unlikely to be thus converted.

The old guard, of course, never had any friends in the media either, but as my colleague Hugh McNeile has lately been showing, journalists by their profession are unable to resist a "good story" when they find one, and many a sound nationalist view found its way into the Press or onto the small screen as a result of some A.K.-activated coup that

temporarily stood the Establishment on its silly head. This is an art that proponents of the nationalist cause appear no longer to practise. We seem to have lost the ability to follow the Duke of Wellington's advice to "get over the heavy ground at lightly as possible." Therefore, it behoves us to find some less heavy going upon which, perhaps, to operate more effectively.

Spreading The Truth

From its beginning, *Candour's* aim has been to spread the truth in the political arena, and today our continued existence — relying as we do on the providence of God and the generosity of our subscribers — proves that to a limited extent we have succeeded, but that, like patriotism, is not enough. Support, not just for *Candour* but for the whole Cause, tends to come from "those who have seen" and have believed. Those who "have not seen" appear to be, for the most part, immobilised in the doldrums of seemingly invincible ignorance. The former have seen their friends and families die or suffer for their country only to endure its betrayal by the very figureheads who had sent them off to war. They have seen the diseased, debt-ridden "Third World" proliferating on the ruins of what were, for all their faults, reasonably ordered colonial empires. They have seen their own lands invaded and despoiled by the tide of black and brown refugees from the tyrannous substitutes for those same empires. The world they fought to defend has been reduced to rabble and corruption, but they still can remember what was good and hanker for more that could be bettered.

The young, on the other hand, who have experienced neither the Great Wars nor the lingering aftermath of the ages of faith before the onslaught of Masonic humanism destroyed all but an heroic remnant, find it difficult to believe that our woes are anything but inevitable or that there are any other remedies than those promised (but not performed) by the minions of the presently prevailing Power. Some even consider that our woes are not woes at all but merely the teething troubles of the new

"liberation". For these misguided worshippers of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, the only evil is nuclear power and their only fear is death — their own, of course. The millions fallen victim of the restrictive or permissive societies dominated by the twin evils of Communism and Capitalism leave them, at worst unmoved, at best incredulous. With no True Faith to sustain them, they cling desperately to the idea of the future attainment of that computer-dominated, robot-ridden, multi-racial heaven-upon-earth which, in all its hygienic dreariness is all the paradise that humanists will allow their dupes to dream of.

These are the aspirations of most of the regular attendant graduates of our so-called educational system. The truants from the system are already despairing victims of uncontrolled appetites. Addiction to pin-tables, porn, drink and drugs have taken fatal toll of their pristine innocence. From being prisoners of vice, they soon become slaves to the purveyors thereof. Still, even all that does not constitute the greatest tragedy of our time. Sin, like the poor, we shall have always with us. No, the greatest tragedy of our time is the prevalent inability to recognise sin for what it is — an offence against God — coupled with the equal inability to give to God His due supremacy in society.

Given our present Masonic arbiters, it cannot be by accident that the feast of Christ the King celebrated on the last Sunday in October was first rivalled and then superseded by United Nations Day. The results of this triumph of naturalism can be seen everywhere in the successful assaults on society's basic unit — the family.

By every channel of propaganda the ease and ordinariness of divorce, fornication, contraception, abortion and, ironically, fertility pills, "test tube" breeding, surrogate mothers and the incorporation of alien stock by adoption have been assiduously emphasised and promoted. "Science can save you when God either doesn't exist or doesn't care" runs the theme of the "liberation". When it appeared not enough mothers had learned the lesson, the State made it economically difficult for one breadwinner to satisfy his family. "Mothers must go out to work." "Latch-key kids" became the norm and the prey of every debaucher in search of a victim. Now homosexuality and incest have been added to the violations of the sanctity of the home.

Again, these acts, terrible as they are, are not the worst crimes of our God-forgetting society — they are the ice-hearted indifference and culpable negligence of those who should be our mentors.

These are the omissions all patriots must be concerned to repair.

Foundation Of All Existence

It was with this end in view that we agreed to bring our Academy to being. Although it is still in infancy, it looks healthy and likely to thrive as long as we hold fast to the principle that enables human institutions to flourish. Fortuitously, I have just been loaned an excellent little book, translated from the French. Its English title is *On God In Society*. It is by Count Joseph de Maistre (1754-1821), a political philosopher recognised as the French counterpart of Edmund Burke. The book is very much to our point as the author — in 1808 — was in no doubt about the end result of the revolutionaries' enthronement of the Goddess of Reason.

"All human institutions obey the same rule," he says, "being meaningless or dangerous unless they rest on the foundation of all existence. The principle being undeniable, what shall we think of a generation which has thrown everything to the winds including the very foundations of the structure of society by making education exclusively scientific? It was impossible to err more frightfully. For every educational system which does not have religion as its basis will collapse in an instant, or else diffuse only poisons throughout the State, '*religion being*,' as Bacon says, '*the spice which preserves the sciences from decay*' . . .

"Originally universities were only theology schools to which other faculties were attached, as are subjects around their queen. Established on such a foundation, the edifice of public instruction had lasted until our day. Those who have overturned it among themselves will long repent in vain. A mere child or a lunatic can burn down a city. But architects, materials, workmen, wealth and, above all, time are necessary to restore it.

"Perhaps equally much harm has been done to mankind by those who, while preserving the exterior forms of ancient institutions, are pleased to corrupt them inwardly. Already the influence of modern universities upon morals and the national character throughout most of Europe is quite familiar." That was in 1808 — ominously prophetic of the Burgesses, McCleans, Philbys, Blunts and the scientists who thought to play God. They, at least, should have taught us that "if the guidance of education is not returned to the priests and if science is not uniformly relegated to a subordinate rank, we shall become brutalised by science, and that is the worst sort of brutality."

It is difficult to argue with that when daily we all experience this brutality and yet still no one appears

to think of subordinating science to theology — and even if one did, liberation theology, which is all our modernist priests have left us with, has already discredited *that* as a cure. Milton's "hungry sheep looked up and were not fed", but our sheep are much worse off: they are taught to look sideways and are stuffed with regurgitated rubbish.

One last quotation, which would have urged us to action if we had not taken it already:

"Creation," says de Maistre, "is not man's province. Nor does his *unassisted* power even appear capable of improving on institutions already established. If anything is apparent to man, it is the existence of two opposing forces in the universe in continual conflict. Nothing good is unsullied or unaltered by evil. Every evil is repressed and assaulted by good, which continually impels all existence towards a more perfect state. These two forces are present everywhere . . . Probably, human powers extend only to removing or resisting evil in order to separate it from good, which may then develop freely according to its nature."

For thirty years we have tried to influence the top and/or the many with little to show but survival, so the time has obviously come to try the bottom and the few. After all, it is the foundations of society that are under the heaviest attack, so that is where we must mount the heaviest counter, relying on God through our own ranks to provide the "architects, materials, workmen, wealth and time" required.

And He *did* say: "Ask and you shall receive."

HELP CANDOUR'S "NOBLE WORK"

From a financial point of view, *Candour* has always resembled "the courageous institution known as Muller's Orphanage," referred to in Mrs. Cecil Chesterton's *The Chestertons* as carrying on "a noble work with inadequate resources." Although in difficulties, it never collapsed. Dinnerless, a joint would mysteriously appear on the doorstep; penniless, a cheque would drop through the front door. Very much the same sort of thing happens to us. However, we *would* like to establish a little more stability in *Candour's* finances, and for that reason we are enclosing with this issue a deed of covenant for the A. K. Chesterton Trust, the object of which is to advance the ideas of our founder. Please fill in whatever amount you can spare and send the deed *intact* to Rosine de Bouneville, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.

MEMORIAL

Shall we say "Forgive them
They know not what they do"
The syndicates of murder men
Whom Christian code eschew?

Shall the world forgive them,
How turn the other cheek?
How unctuous sounds the mere "Amen"
At murder's wholesale streak!

The Russian Revolution,
The child — and now the man,
The instant execution,
Innocence is in the van.

Skyfarers near Sikhaling
Made target for Red might,
What price Comrade Lenin
As two-six-nine unite

The World makes condemnation
Yet there's a rub — the purse
Holds cant the valuation,
But Koreans claim: "A curse!"

The doves of peace are dying
Upon an ocean floor
Their epitaph was "Spying"
Upon the dogs of war.

God rest the souls of martyrs
Who violated — What?
A sacred Russian arsenal —
Or international plot?

B. E. BIGGS.

THE CANDOUR LIBRARY

We wish to buy or be given for our archives pre- and post-war nationalist magazines, pamphlets, bulletins, books, etc. Please write to Hugh McNeile, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD.

A. K. CHESTERTON ACADEMY

Candour readers who would like to attend any future seminars are asked to write, enclosing an s.a.e., to The Director, A.K.C. Academy, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.

CANDOUR'S CLARION CALL

by MARK EWELL

"Sound the Alarm!" — the title of *Candour's* first editorial in October, 1953. Thirty years on, *Candour* is still resounding with the voice of its founder, A. K. Chesterton, himself now dead but living on in the loyal work of his successors.

This article reviews *Candour's* record with reference to the accuracy of its revelations and warnings in four major political fields. The gravamen of the argument has been as follows: that International Finance is a real and recognisable threat to the sovereignty of nations; that every impairment of the principle of nationhood makes countries the more vulnerable to the cancer of Communism; that Communism is not a movement of poor men but of rich men — the richest in the world; and that ever since 1917 the polarity of the United States and the Soviet Union has been fictional. Permutations of all four striking disclosures are many and far-reaching.

Recent developments in High Finance, the British Commonwealth, the Common Market, South Africa, the US role in Europe and Central America, and continuing evidence of a Washington-New York-Moscow axis confirm that A.K. was on target.

The Lords of the Dance

Time and again *Candour* has produced evidence of the destructive policies of High Finance Bankers, and forecast worse to follow. The Great Depression of the 1930s is being re-enacted with a vengeance through curbing the rate of credit creation and manipulating US interest rates, rates that "can make or break the world recovery, sink or sustain the world's debt-ridden industrialising nations." Not *Candour's* words but those of *The Times* (21st June, 1983).

The *Daily Telegraph* has referred to the "awe" in which the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of the U.S. is held. Going one better, *The Sunday Times* City Editor described the Chairman as the man "who seems to hold the whole world's financial destiny in his baseball glove" (24th July, 1983).

"Rattled White House turns on the Fed" ran one headline in the *Daily Telegraph*, but struggle as he may, President Reagan is a victim of the system. The web was woven in 1913 and greatly strengthened in 1980. Any attempt to check the Fed's operational independence would require a majority approval by the U.S. Congress, which is just not on. So, the secretly devised policies of the Fed have a real and

devastating effect on every country plugged into the world financial system.

And a direct effect on U.S. foreign policy.

Consider the implications. To-day, if American interest rates go up by 1%, Brazil's interest payments go up by another 500 million dollars. Repeat this throughout the debtor nations — Mexico, Argentine, Korea, Venezuela, Indonesia, Turkey, the Philippines, Chile, Poland (virtually the whole world, come to think of it!) — and then count the noughts. That is the measure of the horror story of usury rampant. Will all these countries go bankrupt? Unfortunately, not a hope. Will the entire banking system collapse? No such luck. Instead, the manacles of debt are being clamped all the harder.

There will be few unilateral renunciations of debt. "If my country ever defaulted, its ships and aircraft everywhere would instantly be seized by creditors, as would any goods we tried to export," one high official in Brazil is reported as having told the Economics Editor of *The Sunday Times* (17th July). How A.K. would have pounced on this admission! It holds good, too, for the rest of the debtor nations.

What, then, is all the financial hoo-ha in aid of?

Of all the public figures in the U.K., Peter Shore, the Shadow Chancellor, has spelt it out most plainly: the "new monetarism" is the root cause of the present world economic crisis, he says, and is "the most potent force for Communist expansion which has ever been devised" (*Daily Telegraph*, 8th August, 1983).

Rescheduling of debts, bridging loans, new trade credits, rescue packages — all lead to severe cuts in living standards, austerity measures, breadline conditions, massive unemployment, revolution.

Such are the steps of the Financial Dance Macabre!

After the Raj

The forcible disintegration of the British Empire was A.K.'s heartfelt concern. He fulminated against dollar imperialism and betrayal of Britain from within into the hands of the power agencies of the New York Money Trust. In vain. The Empire suffered eclipse and the Commonwealth is following suit.

The result has been summed up by Peregrine Worsthorne in the *Sunday Telegraph* (14th August): Even young Indians often tell visitors from Britain

how much better off they were under the Raj before their country began, literally, to fall apart again. Throughout formerly British Africa the same nostalgic sentiments are also often expressed by blacks disillusioned by the years of so-called freedom. This from an enthusiastic internationalist! For saying as much before it all happened, A.K. was relegated to the lunatic fringe.

Six years after A.K.'s death, Mr. Shridath Ramphal, the Commonwealth Secretary-General, was reported as being wholly in favour of placing the Commonwealth at the service of the United Nations.

Subsequent developments have completely overtaken his magnanimity and put several Commonwealth countries more directly at the service of the USSR. To Zambia, Uganda, Tanzania we can now add Zimbabwe (ruins in name and in fact) whose Prime Minister, Comrade Mugabe, visited Hungary, Czechoslovakia and East Germany in May. At an airport conference on his return he praised "the unbelievable level of development" in the centrally planned economies of Eastern Europe, looked forward to his forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union and even hinted at a security pact with the Communist bloc (*Daily Telegraph*, 30th May, 1983).

[Mugabe's optimism was matched by the Roumanian President Ceausescu's recent promise of closer links with "Zimbabwe". According to the *Daily Telegraph* (18th July, 1983), the Communist head of state "said Roumania would back efforts by Mr. Mugabe to establish a Socialist state"—R. de B.]

Stepping-stone to the United Socialist (Soviet) States of Europe

What of the Common Market, the object of another of A.K.'s predictions?

There, "something is moving though it is not clear what," according to a spokesman for the E.E.C. reported in *The Times* of 7th July.

To the puzzlement of naïve pro-Marketters, the Soviet Union, which until now has refused to recognise the European Community, has appealed to the E.E.C.'s own Court of Justice over an anti-dumping action taken against it by the Commission. Razno Import, a Soviet state trading company, is complaining against a provisional 7% anti-dumping duty on Soviet unwrought nickel. A tit for tat against complaints by Inco Europe, Ltd., a British-based firm, and by Greek and French firms, that the USSR has been selling nickel at dumping prices.

The significance of this development is that the Russian move implies recognition of the Common Market and its Court as legal entities. Community officials expressed surprise and, according to the

above report, "They linked it to the cautious low-level approaches by other Communist countries who do not recognise the E.E.C., particularly Hungary and Czechoslovakia, who appear interested in working out agreements with the Community."

In his pamphlet *Common Market Suicide*, A.K. foresaw this trend and described the common policy of those malevolent political twins, Political and Economic Planning and Chatham House, as envisaging "the extension of the E.E.C. to embrace the Soviet Union and its satellites."

That the Soviet Union's case is to be conducted by a British counsel by name of Professor Francis Jacobs is all of a piece with *Candour's* interpretation.

South Africa Ostracised

The worst of A.K.'s fears about the isolating of South Africa from the West are being fulfilled to the letter.

The West is committing strategic suicide by cold-shouldering South Africa and imposing the arms embargo. South Africa can no longer repair naval vessels bought from the U.K., can no longer replenish her fleet, and has only a few submarines and half a dozen reconnaissance planes to patrol the Cape route through which 80% of oil passes which Europe buys from Asia.

A recently published book entitled *Et Si Nous Parlions D'Afrique Du Sud* by Michel Droit, a member of the French Academy and internationally known political observer, ably and amply confirms *Candour's* case for support of South Africa. Ethiopia, Tanzania, Uganda, Mozambique, Zambia and Angola—what are these now but a Communist corridor across Africa? Thus, as the author points out, with the destruction of the old colonial empires it is now possible for the Soviets, helped by Cuban technicians and infantry, to achieve one of their cherished objectives to go from the Mediterranean to the South Atlantic without virtually ever leaving areas which they control.

France's attitude to South Africa is typical of the West, according to Mr. Droit in an interview with Veronique of *Figaro* magazine republished in *South Africa Foundation News* of June, 1983. France sells arms to Nicaragua to set fire to Central America but rigorously applies the U.N. embargo on South Africa.

Beating a Retreat

What else did A.K. have in mind as he looked to the future? Put simply, the crumbling of the mighty U.S.A. as defender of the West.

At a time when he was constantly exposing the incessant American interference in the affairs of the

British peoples, he nevertheless made the following observation in 1953: "There is no reason to suppose that in a third world war the Money Power might not act to withdraw the United States from the battlefields." Some of our newer readers may gasp. What! With all the American missiles and men in Europe, with all these reports of naval blockades, of military aid to right-wing countries and war games with left-wing ones in Central America. Impossible!

Ever since 1953 the U.S. has had bases in Greece. The U.S. has spent millions of dollars establishing a sophisticated network of military installations both there and in Crete. Now, however, *The Times* of 16th July reports that Athens and Washington have agreed to close these bases for good from 1989. The Socialist Government of Mr. Papandreou even reserves the right to denounce the five year agreement at any time, and links continued operation of the bases with the level of U.S. military assistance to Greece. Britain's newest E.E.C. partner has a powerful minority party, the Communists, to set the pace in this.

Thus the southern flank of Nato is compromised. Were the U.S. Sixth Fleet to be removed, the Mediterranean would become a Soviet pond.

Selling the Pass

With the flaring of the Communist threat in Central America and the massive build-up of Cuban and Soviet arms in Nicaragua (to say nothing of Grenada and Surinam), there is even more reason for the U.S. to divert resources from the European theatre to her own backyard. President Reagan has mobilised warships off the coasts of Nicaragua, ordered thousands of American troops on exercises in neighbouring Honduras, backed up the right-wing government in El Salvador. All reasonable precautions.

But he has bedevilled everything by setting up a bi-partisan Commission on Central America.

The two Hispanic members of this 12-strong Commission, Sr. Henry Ciseros and Sr. Carlos Diaz-Alejandro are alleged to be "soft" on Castroism and frankly do not believe the seriousness of the Soviet threat. More ominous still, the Commission is headed by the man A.K. called "this Winged Mercury", none other than Dr. Henry Kissinger himself; also variously described as the reincarnation of Bernard Baruch and the "mortician of U.S. interests."

In Britain the appointment was hailed with pleasure by Lord Home, himself frequently the target of A.K.'s criticism. Lord Home is sure Dr. Kissinger will find an "acceptable compromise." *Candour*, however, shares Peter Simple's foreboding

at the return to power of the strange Prestidigitating Doctor whose career has been so baffling but so "weirdly consistent", his earnest peripatetic efforts for East-West detente having so often resulted in the steady aggrandisement of the Marxist empires.

An early sign of the coming sell-out appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* of 11th August. There it was reported that, since the Kissinger assignment, some ultra-conservative Republicans are having second thoughts about going ahead with a massive, privately-financed mailing campaign to shore up political support for Mr. Reagan's Central American policy.

Repercussions of the Kissinger appointment have already been felt among Nicaraguan exiles conducting the anti-Marxist rebellion in Nicaragua. Their morale has plummeted because they feel that Washington may be "going cool" on their cause (*The Daily Telegraph*, 17th August). The newspaper also quoted General Gustavo Alvarez, the head of the Honduran armed forces and the U.S.'s own ally, as saying that Washington's hesitation could mean the loss of Central America to Communism.

So, in spite of all the sabre rattling, U.S. withdrawal from the battlefields is certainly on the cards.

The Hot Line Still Hums

In the United States Professor Sutton, Admiral Turner Joy and Mr. Charles Levinson have published irrefutable proof of US-USSR collusion in the buildup of the Soviet war machine and of other liaisons between Washington and Moscow. In spite of storms in the vodka-cola cup, V.I.P. privileges are still mutually accorded to a handful of top men by both power blocs.

At 91, the veteran American Kremlin watcher, Mr. Averell Harriman, is still calling on Soviet leaders and recalling the "good times" between Moscow and Washington, hankering after the intimate wartime relationship between the Soviets and the U.S. Remember his praise of Stalin as a man "who had a good understanding of the other man's point of view"?

In a BBC2 interview with Kenneth Harris on 13th August, Dean Rusk, another old-timer, former President of the Rockefeller Foundation and U.S. Secretary of State during the 1962 Cuban crisis, emphasised that U.S. measures against Cuba had merely put that country into quarantine to give officials in Washington time "to put their heads together with Moscow." A nice slip of the tongue this — the very nub of A.K.'s thesis.

The men who really count in Washington and Moscow have been putting their heads together ever since.

The Ultimate Goal

As a political punter A.K. had the winning streak. Prescience or prophecy? He would have been the last to claim the gift of prophecy. Prescient, yes, because he knew certain basic facts of political life, gleaned over many years as a journalist and political analyst in touch with friends and men of influence in all the continents. Unlike so many other political observers, he had the courage to present, interpret and project these facts holistically and consistently.

One other prediction of his has yet to come to pass. He believed that the US. and the Soviet Union, the two nominally antagonistic super powers, are destined to merge into an all-embracing empire, in short, a World Government.

The *Candour* team proceeds on this assumption and notes the flying of kites from time to time, the latest being a splurge of advertisements in the national press issued by the World Government Age of Enlightenment from Seelisberg in Switzerland.

Pure nonsense as promulgated by His Holiness Maharishi Mehesh Yogi but very useful nevertheless to certain well-established political schemers. The idea has first to be hawked in the market-places of the world.

A.K. promised that his journal would not fail, would not be silenced, would not be bought out of existence. His promise stands. In the next thirty years *Candour* should continue to be compulsive reading.

A. K. SPEAKS

A C.60 cassette tape of A. K. Chesterton speaking on the menace of International Finance.

Introduced by Leslie Greene,
ONLY £3 (£5 OVERSEAS) FROM
Candour Publishing Company,
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.

NOT KEEPING IN WITH THE JONES

by LESLIE VON GOETZ

It is, of course, very sad that patriots cannot always agree with each other, and co-operate for the good of their country, but no useful purpose can be served by silence when the disagreement is fundamental. I was deeply shocked by the article on the scandal of removing exchange controls in the May issue of *Candour* — shocked and slightly frightened, because my gut reaction was so strong and, really, I hadn't realised that it was a topic on which I felt so strongly!

First of all, I must deal with some of the points which seemed to me entirely misconceived, and therefore cloud the argument. P. M. Jones refers to the favoured section of society who dwell in leafy Sussex villages, yet actually earn their living in the sweat shops and squalor of the developing countries where dividends are much higher. That these people are able to do this depends not on *our* lack of exchange controls, but that of the developing countries. The stupid remark about a British sheep in the Falklands Islands receiving more sympathy than an ex-Rhodesian in poverty because of Zimbabwe's exchange control is equally irrelevant. If these controls are a good thing, as P. M. Jones appears to believe, then people obviously have no business complaining about them in Zimbabwe.

I must say that I find it nauseating that someone should hold up as desirable of emulation a country where people are not allowed to remit money, *even for compassionate reasons*. I don't know whether it is true of South Africa, but it is certainly true of all the countries and political systems I most detest that they do exercise such control, and I strongly repudiate any idea of using them as models. We know in our bones that dispossessed Whites in Africa *ought* to be allowed to take their possessions with them. I equally know that if retired pensioners can live more cheaply and happily in Spain or wherever, it is quite preposterous tyranny to stop them. If someone struggling to bring up a family on a farm labourer's income can buy them all jeans from Korea for the same price as one British pair, then I think it is tyranny to make them go in rags on the grounds that they "ought" to be patronising British industry. To grudge our workers their holiday in the sun because domestic tourist centres are having a lean time is breath-taking impertinence. We have a tourist industry *for the rich*. Our beautiful buildings are expensive to maintain, it is expensive to tour the mountains of Scotland, etc. The rich do not mind bad weather because they have changes of clothes, hot baths, warm food. Poor people get shut out of

youth hostels or bed-and-breakfast places during the day even in horrible weather.

Benefit To Financial Power

For the sake of argument I will concede that the nation is indeed declining under the present government, but not because it has done away with exchange control. I suppose we have never declined so far or so fast as during the years in which exchange control was practised, but I am not going to blame our whole decline on it either! Certainly the Financial Power was not in any way hampered by exchange control — very much the reverse! Any kind of controls — unnatural controls — are of enormous benefit to those who have the power to issue licences, permits, privileges, etc., and therefore are a great handicap to normal people.

I am utterly bemused by this picture of our national treasure flowing out of our back door and submerging all our industries in ruin. What is this treasure? Our Currency? Surely not. This was believed in the middle ages — the lumps of gold were seen as true wealth and spending them the prerogative of princes. But really they gave very little comfort except to misers; it is what money will buy that gives its possession charm. We really do need quite a lot of things from other countries. Because we were successful traders — a nation of shop-keepers — we were, in our hey-day, able to buy what we wanted all over the world, but we did not become poor as a result of this. Our pounds were desirable, as good as gold, because they could be used anywhere. A carpet-seller in India or a tobacco merchant in America did not have to ask themselves whether they really wanted anything which was manufactured in G.B. before accepting the proffered coin — they took it because they knew it would be good anywhere in the world and as a result of our currency being an international currency the British people lived better, had to work less hard, could get greater rewards than those whose currency was of no interest to the outside world. Indeed, the part played by "invisibles" in our national balance sheet exactly counteracts the difference in standard of living between a pensioner who lives on his state pension, and one who has a private income in addition.

So, how did it all go wrong? Our war-time debts made the sterling area a liability, our post-war borrowings were — a symptom of our loss of grip rather than a cause. The government had already taken over the overseas assets of British subjects, sold them for a pittance and then by exchange control prevented further investment after the war.

If they had not been sold they would have brought in all the foreign currency we were forced to borrow on such stringent terms. Even then, when we were at a very low ebb, we were still better off because London was the centre of world insurance or shipping. We could have been better off yet if our currency had been preserved from inflation; that was the real sickness, exchange control was simply an attempt to mask the symptoms of the disease, masked so successfully that a whole generation of economists has grown up without understanding what they have been talking about. It is as if doctors were trained in medicine only on patients made up to the eyes, stuffed with tranquilisers and breath-sweeteners. Their skills in diagnosis would be unlikely to benefit.

Certainly, if we do not wish to be the playthings of the great international companies it will be necessary to revise our law of Limited Liability; certainly we must somehow arrange that politicians lose the power to destroy our currency through inflation. Certainly we must stop bankers lending money they have not got to countries who can never hope to repay it, but, funnily enough exchange control didn't seem to stop that little game any more than planning controls stopped Councils from destroying city centres or building high-rise slums. It is preposterous that under exchange control a British subject cannot start producing some new product under licence from the foreign inventor — he can't get the currency to make the original payment. Who can do it? Well, it is easier for an international company who cannot repatriate their profits because of exchange control and so might just as well use them to set up a new industry. Then P. M. Jones will start worrying about why industry in this country is falling into the hands of the internationals. The days of exchange controls were disastrous for our industries concerned with exports. Just as high taxation makes businesses indifferent to real profits if they can only make a tax fiddle, so exchange control made the "business allowance" into a juicy perk for executives' wives, rather than a serious contribution to company business.

In May it was reported that a British firm had gobbled up a machine costing £750,000 for a mere £75,000 from a bankrupt Dutch company. The business they are running will be less loaded with debt, able to sell for keener prices, far more competitive, and therefore far more beneficial to Britain, than if the full price had been paid and proudly "invested in Britain". The whole talk of forcing people to invest in British industries, and thinking of the value of the investment in terms of the money spent, is what makes government action

so wasteful and ineffective. Money spent on school dinners counts as "spending on education", so does spending on text-books even if they are not used or replace ones in perfect condition. Money spent on building and equipping a hospital without adequate cost control and then not being able to staff it, all counts as "health service spending". Those who control the union pension funds are not, thank God, it seems so stupid. What possible benefit for miners' pensions would be gained if they had to buy up all the unprofitable pits? It is their duty to ensure an adequate income for their members, and if it is patriotic to buy British then it is the recipients of the pensions who should do so, not the providers.

Monstrous Loans

Apart from being totally unnatural to force people to invest where they do not see any possibility of benefit, it is grossly unfair to the British public as consumers that they should be deprived of either cheap or high quality goods at the whim of a bureaucrat, or so that manufacturers can make huge profits cornering the British market with goods we would not wish to buy if we were offered a proper choice. All that talk about cutting living standards to the level of . . . is just eyewash. It used to be "to the level of the Japanese" but we don't hear that now that they have a higher standard than we do. The hard fact of the matter is that trade *has* to balance itself out in the long run, or it cannot take place. The Japanese have to sell us cars, videos, etc. because they have to buy fuel. Whining that they won't buy our cars when we buy theirs it like a wife building up a case against her husband by blaming him for trying to get money by working overtime instead of staying home during the week to help her with the ironing. What has produced the ridiculous situation that adult men and women do not understand how absurd they are being, is the massive *loans* which have enabled countries to go on buying without having to offer anything but promises in exchange. The true facts and figures have been so distorted by these loans that they have got us into the position where our enemies have a bigger hold over us by threatening to default, than if they were threatening to bomb us! That situation has been produced by exchange control. Those monstrous loans could not have taken place without it.

Surely a true patriot will want the best for the British, will trust them to manage their own affairs better than foreigners, will be proud of their charities, will think the British, *free*, have saved millions from disaster and degradation in the past and may yet do so again.

SALUTE

Salute to the spirit of Britain at bay
'Gainst Unhappy Lords who betray and betray
The spirit, the culture, the meaning of life,
The morals, the means of John Bull and his Wife.

The pattern unchanged in ten years and a score,
Praise be for the counter in thirty-years-war,
For the gospel of Truth which uncovers the slime,
For the words of a prophet who lived in our time.

The founder of *Candour*, A. K. Chesterton —
To the seekers of truth an inspiration —
His so worthy successor, editorially,
The mantle is perfect on Rosine de B.

Salute to all readers and friends in support
Of a state which is sovereign and a race true and
taut,
Of life which is cherished, of sex which is sane;
'Gainst the old saddened lordship for their trip down
the drain.

B. E. BIGGS.

IN BRITAIN TODAY

Did you know in Britain today there are more Muslims than Methodist, more Jews than Baptists, more Buddhists than Quakers, more Hindus and Seikhs than members of the United Reformed Church.

For this quote we are indebted to OPEN EYE.

Send £2.50 for 6 copies of Open Eye for 1984 to:—

Bernard Smith, 30 Clifton Road, Worthing,
Sussex.

HONEST TO NO GOD

The Bishop of Bath and Wells apparently has no objection to adultery except when it is carried out with no provision for the removal of evidence in the form of a God given child. How honest to no God can a "Bishop" get.

A PEOPLE DISPOSSESSED

by JOHN O'BRIEN

We are pleased to publish below the first of two articles on agriculture written by our old friend and colleague. John O'Brien, whose tragically premature death occurred a year ago.

Two hundred and fifty years ago, Britain was a land of food-producers, operating upon widely differing scales from the large landowner, through the yeomanry, to the peasant smallholder. Much land was held "in common" by village communities; other areas were owned by individuals and worked in "open fields" under the "strip" system. By far the majority of country people had an independence which proceeded from the ownership of land, no matter in how small a way. But from the time of Queen Anne until that of Queen Victoria, the independence of the British yeomanry was continually undermined by successive Parliamentary Acts of Enclosure.

To be sure, some change in agricultural methods had become necessary. New techniques were making nonsense of the open, unfenced, multi-owned, enormous fields. A man could not, for example, grow turnips or specially-sown grass-and-clover on his unfenced strips because the entire "village field", as soon as the corn was harvested, was thrown open as pasture to the village cattle, leaving the innovator without redress. A new system, therefore, had to be developed.

Nouveau-Riche Usurpers

What actually occurred in the eighteenth century was that the lands held by the small farmers and peasants were lost to the larger landowners and squires. Prominent among this new moneyed class were certain *nouveau-riche* families who had invested heavily in land subsequent to their having made fortunes out of the Judeiac banking system introduced from Holland around 1694. The process of "legal dispossession" was accomplished mainly by private Acts of Parliament (the Enclosure Acts), initiated by Parliamentary members or nominees of the new, extensive land-owning element. William Cobbett mentions a number of these influential families in his *Rural Rides* and it is interesting to note how many of them now crop up as merchant bankers. For example, the Baring family bought large tracts of land in Hampshire.

The countryfolk were compensated, of course; the process had to be given the appearance of legality, not piracy. But the compensation was entirely inadequate. Sometimes it took the form of grants of

land (usually that which, being more or less unworkable, was unwanted by the large landowners) or otherwise money compensation was bestowed. Most of the recipients of these favours either killed themselves from over-work on the inferior land, or spent their money-grants at the local hostelry. Thereafter, these previously independent people and their descendants became depressed to the level of farm labourers working on the land they once owned, or migrated to the new towns and mills of the Industrial Revolution. The new "factory system" also absorbed the hand-workers who had been independent "manufacturers" of clothes, implements, furniture, etc., to their village communities, but who could not compete with the new mass-production. The British people ceased to be a mainly rural, self-sufficient, food-producing population.

No more vivid description exists of the plight of the rural population living newly-dispossessed of their ancient independence than Flora Thompson's *Lark Rise To Candleford*. In his perceptive introduction to her masterpiece, H. J. Massingham had this to say:

"... What Flora Thompson depicts is the utter ruin of a closely-knit organic society with a richly interwoven and traditional culture that had defied every change, every aggression, except the one that established the modern world. It is notable that, though husbandry itself plays little part in the trilogy, it is the story of the irreparable calamity of the English fields. In the shell of her concealed art we hear the thunder of an ocean of change, a change tragic indeed, since nothing has taken and nothing can take the place of what has gone.

"On the bottom layer once rested all England ... The old open fields community of co-operative self-help ... the England of small properties based on the land, the England whose native land belonged to its own people, not to a State masquerading as such, not even to the manorial lords who exacted services ... still less to big business ... but self-supporting peasant England ... the last of the longest of all lines.

"The society of "Lark Rise" is one of land-labourers' families ... though pauperised, they were still craftsmanly men: the day of an emptied countryside, harvested by machines and chemicals and of mass, mobile, skill-less labour in the towns

serving the combine at the assembly line was yet to come . . .

" . . . The more amenable of the people were now regarded as 'the deserving poor' and Cobbett's 'the commons of England' had become 'the lower orders' . . . the end was in sight. The end of what? Of a self-sufficient country England living by the land, cultivating it by husbandry and associating liberty with the small property. It was not poverty that broke it — that was a secondary cause. It was not even imported cheap and foodless foods. It was that the Industrial Revolution and the Enclosures between them demolished the structure and pattern of country life. Their traces long lingered like those of old ploughed fields on grassland in the rays of the setting sun. But they have been all but effaced today, and now we plough and sow and reap an empty land. One thing only can ever re-people it — the restoration of the peasantry. But that industrustrialism does not understand. Catastrophe alone can teach it to understand."

In the late-Victorian village thus described, the peasants had lost their independence inherent in the holding of land and stock. They were dispropertied, though still retaining vegetable gardens or allotments; but were merely wage-earners, keeping their families on ten shillings a week, though in 1540 the forefathers of that dispossessed class in another typical village in the same locality had paid their local lord of the manor £46,000 as copyholders to be free of all dues and services to him. Such a village in the 1880s could not have collected 46,000 farthings! Only by such comparisons can the losses sustained by the British peasantry to the large landowner, the merchant, and above all the Money Power, be understood.

Service Of The Overdraft

For almost two hundred years, the drift from country to town has continued. Technical developments in agriculture have produced a countryside all but emptied of its previously teeming population. But the new techniques have produced some massive mistakes. Mono-cropping has resulted in a heavy build-up of pests preying on one specific crop, and the chemicals developed to deal with these have produced a new menace; in the early 1960s, wildlife was threatened with wide extinction as a result of eating food contaminated by chemical sprays. Heavy applications of nitrogenous fertilisers to boost crop weights began to pollute the rivers and streams and this pollution, working its way into the drinking-water, even began to menace the infant human population.

These evils were a product of the new "efficient agricultural industry". It would be unfair to put all the blame on to the farmers — even upon the new, bright, bushy-tailed "agri-businessmen". Much of it rests upon the money system which bears upon them just as it does upon all the rest of the population. For upon us all, but upon the "agri-businessman" most of all, lies the burden of the overdraft, with its insistent demand for loan-interest repayment. In about 1815 Cobbett mentioned that the service of the overdraft had become more important than the service of the land, and of course the banking fraternity has become the beneficiary ever since then, and to an ever-increasing degree.

To farm on a large scale today demands ever more sophisticated, costly machinery. To acquire the land upon which these operations take place, enormously inflated land prices had to be paid. Finally, the modern, specialised farm buildings (which have to be built to the exacting specifications of the Planning Authorities) are extremely expensive. The farmer, as is the habit of modern man, goes to the money market for his loan, and spends the rest of his life in thralldom to the system which has advanced him a book-loan of make-believe money, but which takes back in interest-repayment and capital redemption genuine cash extracted by main force from the over-worked soil. The ultimate loser is the land.

This process, which has become embedded into the whole structure of modern British farming, is not going to be put into reverse suddenly and completed in a few years. Indeed, it would be a mistake to attempt a sudden and revolutionary abolition. The large efficient, heavily mechanised farmer is playing his part in the national food production and should not have to fear any upheavals affecting his individual operations. But there remains a wide field of correction that needs to be undertaken by agencies of Government of mistakes made and injustices perpetrated over the past two hundred and fifty years.

I write "by agencies of Government" deliberately. Just as the rural population was dispossessed and forced off their land and into the towns by Parliamentary legislation, so it will need a whole new series of Acts of Parliament to rectify ancient wrongs. The repossession that I envisage would be accomplished by a phased restoration of ancient common rights by Westminster, the Government acting as a purchasing agency both in this regard and for other non-common land which comes on to the market in the ordinary way. I am not advocating "land nationalisation" or anything approaching it. There would be a gradual take-over of old common

land which the Government would hold in trust for re-settlement as a continual policy of population redistribution as between town and country, reversing the drift from the land which occurred during the Industrial Revolution. The policy would be spread over a number of decades. Some of the resulting land would again be held in common (some of the uplands, for instance), but much of it would be parcelled out in sizes appropriate to small family farms for rent (the Government acting as landlord) and possible eventual sale to suitable sitting tenants.

Thus, a new generation of small landowners would eventually be evolved. What other way is there for large numbers of new, young farmers to get into the industry, what with the enormous cost of land and the high interest rates currently operating? The magnitude of the task brooks no delay.

Next month: A VISION OF THE UPLANDS.

Suggested further reading:

Hilaire Belloc: *The Servile State*, 1912.

William Cobbett: *Rural Rides*, 1830.

Fr. Denis Fahey: *The Church and Farming*, 1953.

Viscount Lymington: *Famine in England*, 1938.

Flora Thompson: *Lark Rise to Candleford*, 1945.

WARNING SYMPTOM

"We must recognise that one of the causes of the disequilibrium and confusion of world economy, affecting civilisation and culture, is undoubtedly the distaste and even contempt shown for rural life with its numerous and essential activities . . . It cannot be too often repeated how much the work of the land generates physical and moral health, for nothing does more to brace the system than this beneficent contact with nature which proceeds directly from the hand of the Creator. The land is not a betrayer; it is not subject to the fickleness, the false appearances, the artificial and unhealthy attractions of the grasping city. Its stability, its wise and regular course, the enduring majesty of the rhythm of the seasons are so many reflections of the Divine attributes." — *Pope Pius XII (1947)*.

HAS-BEENS

Many small, old-fashioned and local varieties of vegetables, grown for centuries in England's gardens and fields, the seeds having been handed down through generations, face extinction on E.E.C. orders. They are the victims of yet another Common Market "harmonisation" measure, Brussels having prepared an official list of "permitted" varieties. Anyone continuing to sell unlisted types of seeds faces a fine of up to £1,000. The vegetables under threat include old bean and pea varieties that dried well, were hardy and tasty, and provided people with a valuable source of protein for winter. As *The Times* admitted in August, the field will be left to the kind that freeze well and can be harvested more easily and profitably by large-scale commercial market-gardening and farming concerns. Brussel sprouts offer another instance of an already apparent trend that the E.E.C. seeks to consolidate: sprout plants which keep the housewife supplied over several weeks are disappearing in favour of those which sprout all at once for mechanical cutting.

Last March, we published an article by Don Bell showing how evidence from the United States confirms the suspicion that the control of food is now on the agenda of those planners who would impose a new international economic order on the world. "Slowly but surely the multi-nationals have been taking over America's agricultural production," he warned, "and the independent farmers that are left are already at the mercy of the multi-nationals [who] control the production of . . . seeds." Not only have the agricultural corporations been buying up the old, small, family-operated seed companies: "they have 'canned' the seeds that reproduce, and replaced them with sterile hybrid seeds. The farmers cannot plant what they grow, they must buy a new crop of seeds for planting each year from the multi-nationals. *The small seed companies were put out of business through bureaucratic labelling requirements fostered by the federal government*" [emphasis added]. Any amateur seedsman in Britain, we note, who wants to register a new variety has to pay an exorbitant £600 for testing and another £80 a year for registration.

As in the U.S.A. the developers of the new world order weave their web, so in Europe the Common Market furthers the scheme of merger and monopoly: political monopoly, economic monopoly, industrial monopoly and even agricultural monopoly, the last being so crucial to life itself. The seemingly insignificant E.E.C. regulations that threaten good old English vegetables are but a microcosm of the macrocosm.

BLUE-PRINT FOR WORLD TYRANNY

by ANTHONY BEAMISH

Schemes for the subordination of the British Crown and People to a supranational world authority have found support from members of all political parties in the Houses of Parliament since the last war. It has been an almost perfect propaganda wicket on which to bat, thanks to the fact that for over half a century the hidden forces that promote these schemes have been unremittingly engaged in conditioning the British people to accept internationalism as a good thing in itself, and never to give a thought to any possibility that it may be an idealistic facade behind which diabolical influences are at work.

One such plan has recently been re-published in brochure form by a body calling itself the Parliamentary Group for World Government (P.G.W.G.), which has its office in the House of Commons. Among its named supporters in Parliament are John Silkin, who is Chairman, and Shirley Williams; before the June election, the Group claimed that 105 M.P.s and peers were members. As all M.P.s are obliged on taking their seats to swear an oath "to bear true allegiance to Her Sovereign Majesty Queen Elizabeth", one is left wondering quite how their honouring of this oath is reconciled with an intention to subordinate the Sovereign to a so-called world government. Is not such blatant advocacy treason?

Steps Towards One-World

Some advocates of "one-world" very likely believe in world government because they are genuinely anxious to further the cause of "international goodwill". They are convinced that it would usher in an era of universal peace and freedom, and would be, by virtue of its own nature, good. It would be easy to laugh at such utopia-mongers as the amiable cranks and woolly perfectionists that, undoubtedly, they are. To do so, however, would be fatal, for the effect of their craving to make a gift of British sovereignty to nobody-knows-quite-whom would be unutterably evil. Consider for a moment what the Parliamentary Group for World Government includes among its goals:

First, it seeks that "Her Majesty's Government should make a solemn declaration that the creation of a world authority will be the aim of its foreign policy". Well, that step was accomplished in 1957 when Lord Gosford, in a speech for the Macmillan Government in the House of Lords, announced that H.M.G. were 'fully in agreement with world govern-

ment. We agree that this must be the goal, and that every step that is humanly possible must be taken to reach that goal" (*Hansard*, November 7th, 1957, column 192). Three years later, the objective was included for the first time in the Labour Party's manifesto. Although there has been scant mention of world government in the election platforms of the major parties in recent years, there is no reason to assume that the vision of a one-world authority, albeit in the different guise of a "new international economic order" or whatever, is any less in tune with their internationalist outlook.

Seeking high-sounding commitments from government ministers for far-off goals is one thing, but the Parliamentary Group for World Government's "comprehensive plan" for creating one-world is rather more disturbing.

It wants to make war by national governments "impossible through enforceable law". A large number of people, one fears, would be likely to give that glib objective an undeserved welcome. This would not be as a result of having considered it carefully. Rather, living in times when there has been warfare and destruction on an unprecedented scale, they would think any specific proposal claiming to prevent future carnage must be a splendid idea.

In actual fact, the ideal is the opposite of the reality, for the P.G.W.G. regards as "essential" to its plan for abolishing war the creation of a "world police force, whose members . . . would enforce . . . world security laws". Control of the force would be by a world security authority answerable to the United Nations; no national allegiances would be tolerated. Individuals and governments would be barred from manufacturing, owning or using arms, except by consent of the new authority.

Possessed of sole right of armed sanctions (including, presumably, nuclear weapons, the world police force would, in reality, constitute a power monopoly out of which no group or individual could contract. Such world governors would feel obliged to secure the continuance of their monopoly by unceasing vigilance and for this purpose, surely, there would have to be maintained, in addition, a *secret* police force. This is hinted at in the P.G.W.G.'s insistence that the "world security authority" would have access for its purposes to "all individuals and territory". It is not difficult to imagine that the methods employed would be somewhat closer to the K.G.B. than to an English county constabulary.

Evidently concerned at fears that traditional British concepts of the rule of law would be destroyed and supplanted, the one-world Parliamentarians assure readers of their brochure that members of their world police force would be individually recruited, with careful safeguards as to the maximum number of individuals from any country. Fantastically, they are currently poised to set the recruitment wheels in motion for the registration of volunteers in co-operation with the International Peace Academy — whatever the Devil that is! A similar project that was launched after the Suez war of 1956, it is admitted, failed through lack of finance.

The P.G.W.G.'s assurance might be sufficient to convince its supporters, but in reality there can be no guarantee that the conditions upon which this country might agree to enter such a system would be honoured. Any person whose instincts are not atrophied and who is aware that there are 760 million-plus Chinese in the world, some 242 million Russians, and only 56 million Britons, would see that in the one-worlders' scheme of things nothing would be less likely to prevail than British decency and British fair play. And having surrendered our forces into the hands of a supra-national junta, and with them our power of national decision, there would be nothing to do but submit. Indeed, the thought has apparently not entered the M.P.s' vacuous heads that were the Soviets or Red Chinese ever to agree to participate in a scheme of this kind, the reason would be that they saw in it a perfect device for extending their revolution over even greater parts of the globe, thereby embracing many more millions of people in the clutches of what Churchill once called "this world-wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilisation and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence and impossible equality." It is to facilitate such an evil end that the one-world M.P.s imagine their constituents elected then?

Well over one hundred infatuated British Parliamentarians, however, are seemingly so naive that they brush aside such consideration as of no account. Have they no awareness of the kind of Hell towards which their dreams of a world government would head us? The prospect is terrifying, although when one gives serious thought to it, the one-worlders' blueprint has as much prospect of implementation in the short term as the equally grandiose schemes bandied about by similar-minded bodies of M.P.s in the early 'fifties. The aim then was the transformation by 1956 of the United Nations Organisation into a fully-fledged World Federal Government, made up of

elected representatives per million-head of population. Although *Candour's* founder, A. K. Chesterton, viewed the plan with grave concern and the League of Empire Loyalists campaigned against it with vigour, on reflection the concept was farcical. Its globally-minded proponents in the Palace of Westminster would have been hard pressed to govern a parish pump efficiently!

Classroom Propaganda

What is of pressing concern about the Parliamentary Group for World Government is the enormous effort that this body devotes to influencing school-children in support of its abominable aims.

Over the last few years much internationalist propaganda has been directed into the nation's classrooms, and it has displayed all the characteristics of sponsorship by efficient and widespread organisations. United Nations Associations, for instance, have sent out tremendous quantities of unsolicited booklets, leaflets and posters. Teachers' publications sponsored by UNESCO have condemned "bigoted nationalism" in history books (*Principles Of Social Reconstruction*) and warned that "as long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only precarious results" (*In The Classroom With Children Under 13 Years Of Age*). The liberal-leftist outlook of many school-teachers has contributed to schools becoming happy hunting grounds for propagandists of the ideas that national pride and loyalty are reactionary concepts and that British independence is not a value to be cherished.

The P.G.W.G. has not been tardy in its efforts, for its brochure devotes a page to the achievements of its Education Advisory Committee, founded in 1959, which works in harness with another cosmopolitan-minded outfit called the One World Trust, whose headquarters are at 24 Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, Westminster.

Summer schools have been organised for teachers on world studies so that "they do not continue to relay predominantly nationalist ideas"; a competition for teachers to devise a world studies syllabus led to a new London University G.C.E. "O" Level paper; between 1973 and 1980 a project was run for the introduction of world studies into secondary schools with the aid of £24,000 from the Leverhulme Trust and £22,500 from the Department of Education and Science; and another project for eight to thirteen-year-olds has been set up with funding to the tune of £76,400 from those two notorious bodies, the Schools Council and the Rowntree Trust.

An Historical Association conference last year was used by the One World Trust's Director, a Mr. Simon Fisher, as a platform to advocate abandoning "our Anglo-centred view of the world" in schools in favour of "global-mindedness". Children should be taught "the affairs of what is variously-called the global village, spaceship earth," he ventured to suggest. Such comic-strip prattle would be ludicrously funny were it not for the ominous threat underlying it to make children the targets of propaganda inimical to their instinctive loyalties.

As if this assault on our youngsters' impressionable minds has not been enough, the Parliamentary Group for World Government now advocates two new initiatives. One is a "world twins" project for under-elevens by means of which child-to-child personal relationships may be built up between pupils from different countries and of different races. Second, the modification of secondary school syllabi is demanded to "encourage a dual perspective, world as well as national." Opportunity should be given in the curriculum for "balancing national loyalty with a measure of conscious loyalty to the human race as a whole," a sentiment which must please Mr. Fisher no end! Existing school history text-books should be examined for "obvious bias," rather in the manner, one presumes, that race relations zealots have purged

school libraries in the Inner London Education Authority.

How poisonous it all is, for while many children do not take long to make the discovery that they should not believe everything that they learn at school, many others are easy prey, being innocently disposed to believe unquestioningly whatever clap-trap is offered to them in print and to repeat slogans thrust upon them by propagandist teachers.

This despicable exercise in putting across a political idea is not going to instil in the latter type of child a mature notion of the diverse loyalties owing to one's friends, one's family and one's country. At best, it would impose on their immature emotions the schizophrenic dilemma of divided and conflicting loyalties, and at worst teach them that the nation-state is an evil and that the natural impulse to defend one's country must be sacrificed to the fantastic and impractical vision of building some future global government.

Mr. Silkin and the other global-minded legislators of the Parliamentary Group for World Government are welcome to their dream of an internationalist Utopia. But readers of *Candour* who have children at school would be well advised to exercise perpetual vigilance if these scheming one-worlders are not to have any further success in foisting an ethic of national surrender on to the rising generation.

WHOSE IDEA?

"World Government involves the surrender to an international police force of all national arms. It is an attractive case to argue before the bulk of electors, in as far as most people are politically superficial, and in as far as their ignorance nowadays is often accompanied by atrophied instincts. That is why it is so dangerous . . .

"The question must surely bang at even the most unsuspecting mind: 'What is behind all this?' It would never occur to a Briton — or to a Frenchman or Swede or American, or anyone else brought up in the Christian tradition — that national police are not adequate for all civil purposes, so that international police, obedient to an authority perhaps thousands of miles away, should have power to arrest a subject of Her Majesty in Her Majesty's domains, or a French or American citizen or whoever it might be. To whom, then, would such an idea occur? The answer is all too easy . . . These people, and these people alone, would wish to send their 'police' agents with extraterritorial powers to arrest in any country miscreants — such as ourselves — who venture to tell the truth about their financial racket and megalomaniac political designs . . .

"There is a hidden power, which only to close students of international politics is a revealed power . . . It has openly declared war on nationhood and racial pride. It approves of every approach, direct or functional, which will render mankind defenceless against its global tyranny." A. K. Chesterton, *"The Menace Of World Government"* (1956).

WHAT KIND OF LAND IS THIS?

Nobody needs telling that our old folk have been treated despicably by successive governments. Party political crocodile tears have been shed at election time and token increases have been made in pensions, but the continuing plight of many old people is a shocking example of the neglect by governments of the interests of Britain's indigenous population. Local authorities, whether Tory or Socialist, are equally culpable in their lack of concern, as the case of Mrs. Kathleen Thurnburn testifies.

92-year-old Mrs. Thurnburn, the *Kensington News* reports, was horrified to receive during the summer a rate demand from Kensington Council stamped "Bailiff" on the envelope and warning her that the council would apply to the courts for a warrant for her committal to prison if she did not pay her rates immediately. All that Mrs. Thurnburn had done was delay payment pending an enquiry to see if her expected rebate had been deducted by the rating office. In nearly 28 years of residence in the borough, she had never failed to pay her rates promptly. When the enormous amount demanded was subsequently paid, even the receipt came back stamped "Bailiff".

Such heartless and high-handed treatment by a London council of a frail old English lady stands in stark contrast to the unbridled pampering of coloured immigrants indulged in by local authorities in London and elsewhere, as a result of the terror struck into their hearts by the Black riots of 1980 and 1981. In the eyes of these traitorous and spineless party politicians, it is a prudent and necessary measure to spend more and more ratepayers' money providing a "positive discrimination" gravy train to enable immigrants to jump the housing and employment queues and be given special welfare and entertainment facilities. Yet the likes of Mrs. Thurnburn, who have to *struggle* to provide themselves with basic food and heating, are left to fend for themselves unless they possess relatives and friends willing to speak up for their needs and rights.

What kind of land do we live in that the good and the decent are treated so abominably? Is this what our forefathers fought and died to defend?

I am writing a book on the many nationalist organisations formed in Britain since 1902. Can any old reader of Candour give me any information on the British Brothers League? Please write to O. C. Gilbert, c/o Candour.

PORTUGAL IN THE PIT

The Portuguese Government, according to *The Times* of August 12th, has signed a Letter of Intent with the master-usurers of the International Monetary Fund which will guarantee the country between 680 million and 730 million dollars in loans. The main aim of the negotiations is to find a way to reduce Portugal's balance of payments deficit from 3.3 billion to 2 billion dollars by the end of this year and 1.5 billion dollars by 1984. Its foreign debt will reach 15.5 billion dollars by December. The I.M.F. loan requires in return that the Portuguese people should have imposed on them severe austerity measures. As it is at present, the economic crisis is so grave that many companies are defaulting on wages owing to their employees.

How history repeats itself for Portugal under Democracy. Once before, the country had an incompetent Liberal-Masonic government and, as a consequence, was mortgaged and bankrupt. Within a few years of its overthrow in May 1926 by an Army coup, Dr. Antonio de Oliveira Salazar fought usury by instituting a corporative system and made Portugal independent of international finance. The whole of Portugal's external debt was repaid and for well over three decades not a single escudo was owed to the international parasites of debt. Such was the measure of the "Fascist" leader Salazar, whose stature, in memory dwarfs the Liberal-Democratic pygmies who now grope and thrash around in their pitiful efforts to shape the destiny of his country.

FATIMA AND THE GREAT CONSPIRACY

Mrs. Deirdre Manifold's best-selling book unravels the Wall Street-Kremlin conspiracy and traces it back to its roots in Reformation times.

NOW AVAILABLE, PRICE £3, FROM
CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Subscribe Today!

U.K.	£4.00
Overseas airmail	£4.50
U.S.A. Dollar Rate	\$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bouneville), Forest House, Liss Forest, England and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.

53, Greencroft Towers,
Felling, Gateshead 10.

THE A. K. CHESTERTON TRUST

COVENANT

To: The Secretary, The A. K. Chesterton Trust, Forest House, Liss Forest,
Hampshire GU33 7DD.

I, (Full names in BLOCK CAPITALS)
of (Full postal address in BLOCK
CAPITALS)

HEREBY COVENANT with THE A. K. CHESTERTON TRUST that for a period of
FOUR YEARS from the date hereof or during my life, whichever period shall be
shorter, I will pay MONTHLY/QUARTERLY/ANNUALLY (please delete whatever
is inapplicable) to the said Trust such a sum as will after deduction of Income Tax
leave in the hands of the said Trust a NET sum of

£...../.....p. (in words pounds, pence)
upon trust to be applied as income for the charitable purpose of the advancement of
education, such sum to be paid from my general fund of taxed income so that I shall
receive no personal or private benefit in either of the said periods from the said sum or
any part thereof.

IN WITNESS whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seal this day
of One thousand nine hundred and eighty

SIGNED, SEALED
AND DELIVERED BY

In the presence of:

Signature of Witness

Address

Occupation

FOR AND ON BEHALF OF

THE A. K. CHESTERTON TRUST Secretary.

BANKER'S ORDER

TO: Bank. Account No.

Please pay to the order of THE A. K. CHESTERTON TRUST, Account No. 7064204,
Lloyd's Bank, 102 South End, Croydon, Surrey.

the sum of £...../.....p. MONTHLY/QUARTERLY/ANNUALLY (please
delete whatever is inapplicable) as from (please specify date)
for the next FOUR YEARS.

Name

Signed Date

